



Zionism and the Jewish Problem

Author(s): John Punnett Peters

Source: *The Sewanee Review*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (Jul., 1921), pp. 268-294

Published by: [The Johns Hopkins University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27533441>

Accessed: 17/05/2014 06:37

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Sewanee Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ZIONISM AND THE JEWISH PROBLEM

The Jewish problem has become within the last few months rather angrily acute both in England and in this country. It has long been a familiar problem on the continent of Europe, in Russia, Poland, Rumania, Germany, and even in France, as witness the Dreyfus case, and now we are experiencing it. The so-called protocols have been published in England and in this country by reputable papers, and high-toned publishers have issued the volumes of those who would warn the world of a Jewish peril. This has called forth from Jewish sources protests, and there have been recriminations and denunciations; but especially it is the Zionist Jews who have been engaged in this warfare, for the Jewish problem is principally the result of Zionism, and the attempt at the practical realization of political Zionism in the mandate under which England has taken Palestine has brought it to the fore.

On sentimental grounds there has long been a tendency among English-speaking people to sympathize with the Jewish religious dream of restoration to Palestine and consequent revival of the ancient glory of Jewry. Sympathy with this dream was elicited by the persistent hope and faith which through manifold vicissitudes and much suffering had enabled the Jew to maintain a separate existence awaiting its fulfilment. That vision of restored glory had kept alive a spirit of idealism in the souls of a people otherwise steeped in a crass and sordid materialism, and the glamour of it, like a jewel in the mire, appealed to the imagination. Affected by such sentiment, few have examined the Jewish claim to Palestine historically, or considered it in its relation to the similar sentimental claims of the great body of Occidental and Oriental Christians, of Mohammedan believers everywhere, or to the practical claims of the present inhabitants of Palestine.

Historically, the Hebrews acquired Palestine by the usual process. Lusting after the good things of others, the Hebrews invaded the country of the Canaanites, following the worldwide method pursued by countless numbers of other peoples, who, with greater or less cruelty robbing and despoiling those who

had industriously tilled the land and accumulated wealth, have possessed themselves of that land and that wealth. The record of the contest as handed down in Hebrew tradition is rather gruesome; not more so, however, than that of other similar conquests, and in point of fact less so than appears at first sight from the Old Testament record. The Hebrews to a large extent united with the previous population, adopting their language and much of their civilization, and taking over many of their shrines, with their religious, political and other customs and traditions. In places, Hebrew and Canaanite amalgamated by intermarriage, in others they dwelt side by side in amicable relations. In some there was perpetual hostility, and in some the Canaanite was altogether blotted out. The whole land was never fully possessed, even at the time of David. He, however, established a Hebrew kingdom in Palestine and put the Canaanites not already amalgamated under tribute, and ultimately by victorious raids and wars the neighboring peoples also, thus creating what may be called an empire, covering almost all of the territory from the borders of Egypt to the river Euphrates. David's empire laid the foundation of that dream which has come down among orthodox Jews to this day, of the reestablishment of a great kingdom of Israel, possessing all David's conquests, with much more besides, and dominating the world. David's empire lasted for two generations. It began to disintegrate under Solomon, and under Solomon's son all the remaining tributaries threw off the Hebrew yoke, while the Hebrews themselves divided into two parts, the larger part, and the more advanced in culture and religion, constituting the Israelite kingdom, whose descendants are the modern Samaritans; the smaller part, chiefly David's own tribe, the kingdom of Judah, occupying a tiny territory about Jerusalem, not so large as a fair-sized county in this country or in England.

This petty kingdom of Judah endured for three hundred and fifty years, sometimes independent, sometimes a subordinate or tributary state, and then Jerusalem was destroyed and the better part of its nobles, priests and skilled artisans deported to Babylonia, while others fled to Egypt, leaving only a peasant population to possess a moiety of the territory of Judah immediately

about the ruins of the ancient capital. Largely through the influence of Ezekiel and some fellow-priests the exiles in Babylonia maintained their integrity, and half a century later such of their descendants as would, were permitted and helped by the Persian conqueror, Cyrus, to return from Babylonia to their homeland and rebuild Jerusalem and the Temple. Few took advantage of this opportunity. They could not or would not make the sacrifice or undergo the hardships involved in the transfer of their domicile from the rich and safe Babylonia to the poor and half barbarous Judæa. So they developed a theory that some day their God would transport them and their wealth together to a transformed Palestine, and continued in Babylonia to bewail and pity themselves as the *Galutha*, or Captivity, making amends for their failure to return by a visit or pilgrimage once in a lifetime, by money contributions, and by a painstaking application to and development of the theory of their religion, and especially of a law of exclusivism which should keep them separate from the people among whom they lived, until the Lord should intervene to carry them back in triumph to Jerusalem. This theory their superior education, their greater wealth, and their material support enabled them to impress upon their compatriots in Palestine, until at last there was built up there a religious community, with the Temple as its centre, where priests might sacrifice and pray for their brethren throughout the world, all of whom were bound together by this holy law of separation from the peoples among whom they lived, counting Jerusalem as their future home, to which they should sometime be wafted from the four corners of the earth by the power of the Lord, who would also make Palestine a land flowing with milk and honey, and establish there a king of David's line, to avenge them on all who had oppressed them and to establish a mighty dominion. This was Judaism, and with the establishment of this ideal came into being the people who called themselves Jews and to whom we give that name in distinction from Hebrew or Israelite. Judæa itself constituted under Persian rule a church rather than a state, autonomous, religiously and socially, although obligated to recognize the Persian suzerain in its sacrifices and its prayers, politically and economically a part

of the Persian empire, ruled by Persian officials. Under this system Judaism grew and thrrove, Jerusalem became rich and prosperous, and Jews multiplied and waxed fat and influential in all parts of the empire.

But in Judaism there were at war two principles, the one the principle of rigid exclusivism, the development of a legalism which should completely mark off the Jew from all other peoples, prohibiting marriage with them and social intercourse. This had its centre in the Captivity, that is, among the Jews in Babylonia, but became dominant in Judæa from the time of Ezra, forcing among other things the breach with Israel or the Samaritans. The other principle is that which we call the prophetic principle, which found expression in the prophets from Amos onward, and in its highest form in the great Prophet of the restoration,¹ who set forth the view that Israel might not live for itself, that its dispersion among the Gentiles was for the beneficent purpose of revealing to the Gentile the glory and love of the one true God and uniting Jew and Gentile together in the service of that God. The former party looked to the reëstablishment of David's kingdom and their triumph over the nations before whom they must now cringe. The latter looked to a kingdom of God upon earth the basis of which should be love and service, and in which Jew and Gentile should be united. The former party prevailed, but in the sacred book that was adopted as a guide of life for the Jews, both the Law and the Prophets were included, the former being given, however, much the higher place and counted the supreme authority.

Religious national exclusivism, it should be said, was not originally peculiar to the Jew. It was the property of practically all ancient religions, but under the influence, first of the Persian empire, then of the great Hellenizing movement resulting from the conquests of Alexander the Great, and finally of the establishment of the Roman Empire, this older conception of the separateness of peoples one from another, and the combination of their religion with their state in this separateness, was broken down, in some places altogether, in others in part. Only

¹ Isaiah, 40-66.

the Jew resisted with all his might this tendency, and developed his Law for that purpose. So persuasive, however, was Greek civilization that to it Judaism almost succumbed, and there was a period, at the beginning of the second century B. C., when it seemed as though the Jew was in a fair way to be Hellenized and to lose his exclusiveness. The attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to expedite this by a religious persecution led to that glorious outburst of national spirit under Mattathias, and his heroic sons, Judas, Jonathan and Simon, which restored the Jewish state and nation and revived in new form and greater power the old hope of the restoration of David's glorious kingdom and the triumph of the Jew over all the world. From the Maccabean rebellion onward to the final destruction of Jerusalem under Hadrian—a period of almost three centuries—the Jewish world was in continual ebullition. On the one hand was developed to its ultimate degree the doctrine of national and racial exclusivism, connecting itself with the study of the Law; on the other hand, connecting itself more particularly with the study of the Prophets, there developed revelation or apocalypse, the doctrine of the wonderful last days, which lifted men's souls out of earth, inspiring them with visions of heavenly glory and inciting them to heroic deeds or atrocious acts of fanaticism. Jew persecuted Jew in the attempt to bring about a holy uniformity after his opinion, and so insure the expected divine intervention, and those that remained were knit more closely together in their conviction that they were the chosen of God, especially privileged and gifted, intended by Him to rule the world, and in their hatred and despite of the Gentile, who opposed God and His plan for them. There resulted first the insurrection which brought about the Jewish war and the capture of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 A. D., and consequent anti-Jewish legislation and prejudice. This in its turn inflamed Jewish hatred, and led, when the opportunity offered because of the Parthian war in Trajan's reign (when the empire was hard-pressed, and the provinces were denuded of soldiers to protect the frontiers), to the uprising of the Jews wherever they were numerous, and their massacre with horrible cruelties of the peaceful and unarmed populations in Cyrene, Egypt and Cyprus; to their rebellion in

Mesopotamia; and finally to that last heroic and horrible revolt in Palestine under the leadership of Bar-Kochba, whom they had acclaimed Messiah, which it taxed the whole power of mighty Rome slowly to suppress, and the complete destruction of Jerusalem by Hadrian in 132 A.D. It was these experiences which caused Rome, generally so tolerant, and which had formerly granted the Jews special privileges and exemptions, to treat them with peculiar rigor, especially on account of the danger lurking in their hope of a restored kingdom of David, with Jerusalem as its centre. They were forbidden to come within sight of their ancient holy city, and to expropriate and in their estimation defile it, there was built on its ruins a Roman town, and a Roman temple to Jupiter was erected where formerly the Jewish temple stood. Further, they were subjected to repressive and restrictive legislation touching their peculiar rites and practices; but with invincible persistency and faith the Jew adhered to his ritual and his hopes. This prolonged period of fierce and fanatical struggle against the Gentile intensified the Jew's own sense of alienation from and superiority to his fellow-men; on the other hand, it inevitably developed in the minds of the Roman authorities and of the populations under their rule the conception of the Jew as an enemy to the state, who must be kept under and oppressed for the welfare of the community, a conception which was passed on as a heritage to future generations. On both sides the sins of the parents were to be handed down to and visited upon the children for generations of generations.

It was during the last hundred years of this period of Jewish ebullition and outbursts that a great schism developed in Judaism itself,—Christianity, a minority movement which connected itself with the prophetic, as over against the legalistic, heritage of Jewry. Of this movement a distinguished Jewish scholar, the late Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., of Philadelphia, has written:—

“Christianity broke at its foundation with Jewish nationalism. It definitely cut the thread that bound religion to the limitations inherent in associating religion with the group. The significance of the teachings of Jesus lies just in this circumstance, that he brought the . . . concep-

tion of religion as preached by the Prophets and which made religion solely a matter between the individual and his conscience more definitely and in an uncompromising form into the foreground. It is an error to suppose that the Jews rejected the religious *teachings* of Jesus. They *could* not have done so, for these teachings breathed the same spirit as those of their own Prophets, but the weight of tradition and of their established attitude of mind, attached to the pressure of the religious conception current about them, was sufficiently great to prevent them from accepting the *implications* of the position taken by Jesus, though even these were identical with those of the Prophets. The Jews could not conceive of a Messiah who was not also a nationalist. Jesus could not conceive of Judaism except as detached from Zionistic longings—and so the inevitable break took place.”²

The break became acute when, especially under St. Paul’s leadership, the Christian Church proclaimed the equality in Christianity of Jew and Gentile. This aroused the Jew to bitter hostility and an attitude of violent persecution. To him the Christian was a renegade and a traitor in the camp who, in the dire need of the nation to stand together against the world, took sides with the foe, and stabbed the defenders of the ramparts from behind. This animosity was naturally not diminished by the fact that the Christians claimed to be the true Israel, inheritors of all those promises made in the Old Testament, which, however, they spiritualized and detached from their merely local and temporal significance as belonging to Jerusalem and Palestine. The Christian’s new Jerusalem and his new twelve tribes of Israel were a world conception. Christianity was the heir of the Prophets; Judaism of the Law. Each accepted the Old Testament as Bible, but ultimately each added to it a new interpretation, constituting a new Bible, the essential Bible of either side: the Christian, the New Testament, the Jew, the Talmud. The bitterness of the Jews against the Christians led them to endeavor to bring Christianity within the toils of the Roman law and to

² Jastrow: *Zionism and the Future of Palestine*. This is by all odds the best book on Zionism which I have seen, and I have been greatly indebted to it in the preparation of this article.

procure its persecution by the Roman state, as later orthodox Judaism invoked state aid in the persecution of the Karaites, and then of the followers of the great Maimonides, which reacted also against themselves. The Christian on his side developed no little bitterness against the Jew, as may be seen from Paul's Epistles and from Revelation, where the Jews are called the "Synagogue of Satan". When the Christian conquered the Roman state he was in his turn conquered by the spirit of that wonderful empire, its administrative and legal methods, and its *Volkgeist*, its customs, habits and prejudgments. Christianity adopted the anti-Christian position of the identification of Church and State, with the concomitant principle of persecution, and, with the double prejudice inherited from its own experiences and those of Rome, the Jews became in their turn the victims of persecution by this perverted Christianity.

From the separation of Christianity from Judaism dates, one may say, the orthodox Jewish faith, the four cornerstones of which are: (1) belief in one God, (2) belief in a Messiah who shall redeem God's chosen, (3) belief that the Jews are God's chosen people set apart and bound to keep themselves separate from all nations of the earth, and (4) the belief that God will ultimately gather his chosen people in Palestine, restore the Holy Temple, service, sacrifices and all, and the Jewish kingdom and priesthood. The former two principles or beliefs are not, the latter are, peculiar to the Jews. While here and there the Jews have followed false Messiahs, or established temporal states by force of arms, in which cases they have shown themselves intolerant and persecutors, yet in general it may be said that this Zionism, which has been the belief of the Jews through all the ages since Christianity has been dominant, has not, for many centuries certainly, directly endangered or embroiled the state by its endeavor to realize its expectation of a return to Palestine and the establishment there of a Jewish state. They have expected that this would be brought about, not by human agency, but by a direct intervention of God. While the Jewish Church and nation were in their minds one, the nation was in abeyance, the church only functioned.

Because, however, of their point of view that they were a chosen people, separate and bound to keep themselves separate in blood and customs from all about them, the Jews constituted an unassimilable mass wherever they found themselves, and have been on that account equally obnoxious to Roman paganism, to Christianity and to Islam. For ordinary purposes their attitude has seemed to the rest of the world to be that of the famous grace: "God bless me and my wife, my son John and his wife, us four and no more". This position rendered persecution and religious-racial prejudice inevitable. The persecution which the Jews suffered was in some part religious, but chiefly political, economic and social. The Jew resisted with singular stubbornness, and the results were, on the whole, worse for the persecutor than for the persecuted. Jewish racial pride and religious intolerance were intensified, the latter displaying itself in bitter persecution, so far as their position permitted, of all apostates, the former in their almost pathetic boastfulness in the success of those of Jewish stock, even though renegades, as an evidence of the inherent superiority of the race. The Jews were bound more and more closely together, constituting an international religious-racial unit, inside which they developed singularly beautiful conditions of trust and mutual helpfulness, and an idealism in certain regards very noble. As the opportunity for physical achievement was denied them, mental qualities took their place, which made them in the ordinary competition of life, and in the business world particularly, more than a match for their oppressors. On the other hand, they developed certain offensive habits of servility and that trickery and chicanery which such conditions will produce in any race, which have been the ground of much of the social objection which the Christian feels toward the Jew. But after all has been said which can be said to palliate or explain the persecution and oppression of the Jew through the Christian ages, the chief blame therefor must rest upon the Christian, because his was the position and consequent responsibility of power, and further because he professed principles which made his conduct the more damnable. The relation of Christian to Jew through the 1,600 years of Christian rule is not a pretty memory, and the

Christian world suffered the inevitable in the degradation of its moral fibre, and in the destruction of some of the elements most desirable in the progress of civilization, culture and religion, of all which things Exhibit A is Spain, where Jewish persecution was carried to a terrible extreme.

It was toward the beginning of the last century that a new movement made itself felt in Judaism, as a consequence of that new movement in the Christian world which expressed itself in the French Revolution and the establishment of the American Republic, spreading everywhere new conceptions of liberty and freedom. With our own country in the lead there came for the Jew political emancipation, gradually extending from the west eastward, made effective as far as Vienna and Berlin by the middle of the last century. As a result of this political emancipation and the removal of the civic disabilities under which they had labored for so many centuries, some Jews began to lose the consciousness of being a separate political unit, and there arose in Judaism a movement to adapt the external character of Judaism to these new conditions. This was Reformed Judaism, conceived by Mendelssohn in the eighteenth century, and brought to birth by freedom in the nineteenth. It moved the ethical ideas of the Hebrew prophets into the foreground, as over against the ritual and the ceremonial of legalism. Its adherents sought to be true citizens of the country in which they found themselves, following in this the recommendations of the prophet Jeremiah to the Jews in Babylonia 2,500 years earlier. The essence of reformed Judaism was the dissociation of religion and nationality. It would separate Church and State, breaking all national and racial barriers, and making religion the life of the individual, according to the dictates of his own conscience. Israel would be the chosen people, not in the sense of possessing a tribal deity separating them from the rest of the world, and of looking for special privileges from that deity, but as especially gifted with the knowledge of the true God and therefore with the solemn obligation, imposed by their historical position, to spread the doctrine of Divine unity and to exemplify the teachings of their religion by their conduct in life, not merely toward their fellow-Jews but toward all men. This is

beautifully set forth in the words of a prayer contained in the *Abodah Israel*:—

“Thou hast chosen us from among all nations, and in Thy love hast assigned unto us the priestly mission of spreading the knowledge of Thy Holy Name, so that we may not alone perform Thy commandments, but consecrate ourselves to Thy service.”³

This new position and new opportunity of the Jew produced the inevitable reaction. The newly arrived always attains a self-consciousness which asserts itself in an aggressiveness and bumptiousness obnoxious to those who arrived before. This is true of both individuals and races. In the industrial and social world, where it is a phenomenon so common that it has found abundant expression in literature, it is answered by snubs and a species of ostracism; in the political world, by more overt action. Where it is a race or nation, and not an individual, raised or liberated which expresses its self-consciousness at a new arrival, the expression becomes more obnoxious and the response more emphatic. If religious or racial differences mark off the newly arrived, religio-racial prejudice manifests itself, always most emphasized, of course, where these newly arrived constitute a large element of the population, in which case the old possessors are instinctively drawn together to battle for their place and their integrity. Unfortunately, just at this time the Germans also began to develop first a national and then a race consciousness, a development enormously accelerated by the victories of 1866 and 1870. The consequence was *Teutonism*, which ultimately resulted in a conception by the German of his race and its mission strikingly similar to that of the Jew. This new German race-pride and Jewish self-consciousness led to the Berlin *Judenhetze* of 1880-'81 and the organization of Anti-Semitism. This was not religious in its inception, the leaders being rather anti-religious Teutonists and Wagnerites. The dominant position of Germany ensured the spread of Anti-Semitism,

³ It should be said that the older Hebrew prayer from which this English form was adapted by the late Rabbi Jastrow does not represent the same noble humanitarian aspiration.

as of the nationalistic race movement. It naturally manifested itself in its worst form in Russia, where the Jews were massed in great numbers, namely, in pogroms, for the same reason that race prejudice against the Negro manifests itself in the southern part of the United States in lynchings. The solid mass of the Jews seemed to constitute a political and economic menace, which the relatively ignorant and unprogressive Russians knew how to combat only by violence. In Russia, moreover, Judaism manifested itself in its crudest and most unmitigated form, not only in its practical application of the Golden Rule to the Jewish neighbor alone, but in its distinct doctrinal exception of the Gentile from the scope of that rule. On the other hand, in Russia as nowhere else, there were emancipated Jews who had broken loose from all religion, and rebelled against the whole social-economical system which had so oppressed them, anarchists and revolutionaries, often men and women of marked ability. On the Russian side there was an ignorant and superstitious piety among the masses, easily inflamed to fury against enemies of the faith by a corrupt bureaucracy, which dreaded progress in Church or State. Hence the infamous May Laws and the pogroms, which began to scatter Jewish refugees from Russia throughout the world.

The effort to provide for the Jews coming out of Russia and the effort to protect from persecution the Jews remaining in Russia brought together Jews of East and West as never before. It was this effort which developed economic Zionism. What should be done with all these Jews coming out of Russia? They had been separated from the soil for centuries. They had lived within the pale and in ghettos. They were to a considerable extent parasitic. It was necessary to introduce them to industrialism and agriculture. The former they took to more or less naturally, the latter unwillingly, and yet the wisest Jewish leaders considered it of the first importance to bring back a part at least of the Jewish race to the soil.

Attempts of all sorts were made to establish Jewish agricultural colonies in this country and in South America. Proposals were made looking to the settlement of Jews in East Africa and in Egypt; and colonies were established in Palestine. This was an

economic and philanthropic Zionism, a movement with which Jews everywhere sympathized and Christians of every sort. It did not seek to colonize Jews in Palestine with the idea of claiming Palestine as the homeland of the Jews, the chosen people who are entitled to dispossess all others, to take possession of that land and to rule the world; but it was felt by Jew and Christian alike to be a proper thing to colonize refugees from persecution in a land which had for them both historical and sacred associations. There seemed something infinitely touching and lovely in bringing them back in that way. As in the old days of the release from the Babylonian captivity, there were few who actually returned to Palestine. The great bulk of the Jews brought out of Russia sought homes in Europe or the Americas, and especially in our own country.

This contact of the Jews of the East and West strengthened the feeling of race solidarity, and even agnostic Jews who had abandoned Judaism began to realize anew the bond of race kinship. Numerous societies of one sort and another sprang up here and there seeking to solve the new problems which arose, to remold Judaism or to secure the rights of Jews, and thus prepared the way for the third and present phase of Zionism, racial-national or political Zionism. This was a further development of race self-consciousness, connecting itself naturally with the general movement of racial rehabilitation which made itself felt toward the close of the last century throughout the world, beginning in Germany with Teutonism. On the large scale, there were Teutonism and the Pan-Slavonic movements; on a smaller scale, the Cymric and Celtic movements. Enthusiasts and faddists were trying everywhere to find some little race whose language, racial traditions and racial integrity might be exploited or restored. Germany stretched out her arms into this country to grip her emigrants who were settled here and make them no longer Americans but Teutons, or, if Americans, at least Teutons first. It was with Teutonism that racial Zionism had its closest affinities. The leader of this new racial or political movement was Herzl, a journalist of Vienna. A Jew by race, not by religion, finding himself socially at a disadvantage, he came to believe that he and others similarly situated were hampered in the

fulfillment of their aspirations by racial prejudice on the part of the Christian majority. Convinced that even though the Jew were to become Christian, he would be regarded as a Jew because his race had no national home, he reached the conclusion that the only method of breaking down prejudice was to reunite those who were Jews by race only, as well as those who were Jews by religion, in one great nationality, securing for them a homeland somewhere. This homeland would, in his opinion, exalt their honor and procure respect in whatever foreign country they might live, precisely as Germans or Italians or Frenchmen living in England and America, though aliens in those countries, are respected because they have the protection of a national homeland. Herzl displayed a remarkable ability in urging his claim. It appealed to the self-consciousness of a great number of racial Jews who, like himself, were galled by a prejudice against them which they did not know how to overcome and against which, therefore, they welcomed any quick-cure panacea, and he achieved speedy success. The first Zionist congress was held in 1897, and from that time the movement developed rapidly. It fell in with the dominant racial movement which was sweeping the world. It expressed that something which appealed to men who, become conscious of power and strength, found themselves hampered in taking the places they believed were theirs; it harmonized with the philanthropic appeal to aid oppressed Jews and give them a home; and it touched a sentiment rooted in ancestral tradition which powerfully appealed to all religious Jews, and which many of those who had practically cast off Jewish orthodoxy could not escape from,—a sentiment which Disraeli has expressed in the words put in the mouth of the high priest in his novel *Alroy*:—

“You ask me what I wish? My answer is the land of promise. You ask me what I wish? My answer is Jerusalem. You ask me what I wish? My answer is the temple. All we have forfeited, all we have yearned for, all for which we have fought, our beauteous country, our holy creed, our simple manners and our ancient customs.”

How powerful was this latter appeal of sentiment can be seen by the frequent citation of these words of Disraeli both by agnostic Zionists, and by Zionists of Reformed Judaism, neither

of whom can possibly, one would suppose, desire the restoration of a theocratic state under the Jewish law, or of the Temple with its sacrifices.

Not being Jews by religion Herzl and his first followers were ready to establish this Zion anywhere where land could be obtained, and entered into negotiations with the English government for a tract of land in East Africa. But the sentimental appeal of Palestine was so strong that the idea of any other country had shortly to be abandoned, and before Herzl's death in 1904 this general principle was adopted by the Zionist Congress: "The object of Zionism is to establish for the Jewish people a publicly and legally assured home in Palestine". The Zionism here referred to is a definitely organized international movement governed by a congress and a committee. Its purpose is to strengthen and develop race-consciousness among the Jewish *nation*, for so they designate all people of Jewish race in all nations throughout the world, binding them together by a revival of their ancient language, a study of their literature and a community of interests, and to provide as a homeland for this Jewish *nation*, Palestine, to which their ancient traditions look. This is to be the heart and centre of Judaism throughout the world, and, wherever the Jew may live or have his being, it is hoped to infuse him from this centre with the national life and the national intelligence.

The great and evident danger of this movement is the development of a race allegiance paramount to the national, and it was a sense of this danger which led a body of prominent Jewish citizens of this country to present to President Wilson, by Congressman Julius Kahn, for transmission to the Peace Conference at Paris on March 4, 1919, a protest "against such a political segregation of the Jews in Palestine or elsewhere", first, "because the Jews are dedicated heart and soul to the welfare of the countries in which they dwell under free conditions. All Jews repudiate every suspicion of a double allegiance, but to our minds it is necessarily implied in and cannot by any logic be eliminated from the establishment of a sovereign state for the Jews in Palestine". The second objection is to the unfortunate effect such "political segregation of Jews would have

on the millions of Jews who would be unable to migrate to Palestine from those states where a strong prejudice already exists against them". The establishment of a Jewish State will manifestly increase that prejudice and serve in such states "as a new justification for additional repressive legislation". The multitudes who remain would be subjected to greater discrimination or persecution than before. The third objection is to the serious danger of sanguinary conflicts with the present inhabitants of the land and their co-religionists which the proposed establishment of such a state is sure to involve. The fourth objection is that "the re-establishment in Palestine of a distinctively Jewish state" is "utterly opposed to the principles of democracy which it is the avowed purpose of the World's Peace Conference to establish". The fifth objection, which has been keenly felt also by orthodox Jews, is that it would substitute a merely national bond for "the bond of common religious principles and experiences".

Supplementing objections two and three,—it may be observed that Palestine has been for a longer time in possession of the Moslems than it ever was in possession of the Jew or of the Hebrew race. The present inhabitants of the land claim its possession with as good right as the inhabitants of any country in the world; and not only that, Palestine is a holy country to the Moslem and to the Christian as much as to the Jew. Christians have occupied it and fought and bled for the possession of its holy sites, and the Christian has left far more marks of occupation and cultivation on the land than did the Jew. In normal times tens of thousands of pilgrims of both religions visit its religious sites every year. The Christians especially have invested immense funds in the land for religious and educational purposes in connection with those holy sites and the pilgrims who visit them, and the number of Christian and Moslem dead who lie buried within sight of Jerusalem, in the hope of bettering their chance in the hereafter, is greater than the number of Jews whose graves cover the slopes of Olivet. For every Jew who has a sentimental claim to Palestine as the land of his forefathers and of his faith, there are hundreds of Christians and Moslems who with some similar sentiment make a like claim upon the land. To plant

a Zionist State there is to run great risk of religious turmoil, and to invite grave perils to those who make such settlement.

While the dominant control of the Zionist party is at present in the hands of those who are not religious but merely racial Jews, and while the movement is in itself political, the glamor of it has appealed to considerable numbers of the religious Jews, both orthodox and reformed, and the number affected by that appeal seems to be on the increase, as a result of the "Zionist Mandate" accepted by England from the Peace Conference. One can understand, without approving, the appeal which a Zionist State makes to the Jew who believes he is one of a race chosen by God, marked off from the rest of the world as a peculiar people, to whom God gave the land of Canaan as his people's possession and Jerusalem as their holy city, appointing the Temple as the place of His dwelling in their midst, where they are to offer sacrifices to Him, and whence He is sometime to manifest Himself in glory, subduing their enemies and making them dominant over them. It is difficult to comprehend how a Zionist State can appeal to those more modern Jews who believe in Judaism as a religious, ethical force only, for Zionism would make religion dependent on locality, creating a holy city, which in the common experience of all religions everywhere has always resulted in the creation of an unholy community; and in point of fact, such Jews are in general opposed to Zionism. The establishment of a Zionist State on the old orthodox basis—and the orthodox Jews in the end are in the vast majority, and it is they largely, and not the agnostics and the theoretical Zionists, who are returning and who will return to Palestine—is to run the risk of a revival on an enormous scale of the old hostile attitude of the Jew against the world and the world against the Jew, which brought about the awful tragedies of the past. The development of race-consciousness and a peculiar obligation to Palestine, at which the merely political and racial Zionists aim, is, it may be added, a duplicate of that Teutonism from which the world has so sadly suffered in the recent past. The result of such a development must be inevitably in the end to make the Jews bad citizens of the United States or of any other country and to keep alive and increase that hostility to the Jew which results not so much

from difference of religion as from the pronounced and obtrusive differences of race, nationality and political allegiance.

The experiment of the Zionist homeland is now being tried. It is too early to determine fully how it will work, but it is at least of interest to consider its manifestations so far. My earliest contact with Zionism and Zionist influences in Palestine dates from 1902. When I first visited Palestine, in 1890, the Jews in Jerusalem were almost exclusively of old oriental Sephardic families. Jerusalem was then still the old Jerusalem within the walls. There were no houses without. Jewish colonization, economic and philanthropic in character, had just then begun on the Sharon plain, but what little there was in the way of colonization was a feeble, unsuccessful exotic—an attempt to replace the persecuted Jews of Russia on the land, where, however, the Jew, unused to manual and especially farm labor, sat under an umbrella to protect himself from the sun and engaged native Syrians to do the work. On my next visit, in 1902, more colonies had been planted, and a serious effort was being made to turn the Jewish colonists into farmers. The majority of the Jews who had come to Palestine, however, were settled about Jerusalem, and the new Jerusalem without the walls was larger, in space at least, than the old Jerusalem within. The Alliance Israélite had developed there splendid schools to teach agriculture, and manual and industrial arts. I was urgently solicited by the management to visit and inspect these schools. Here I found Jew, Moslem and Christian working side by side without prejudice. This was, in my judgment, the best work of any sort being done in Palestine, for two reasons: first, these schools were teaching the dignity and the worth of manual labor, which the oriental of all sorts had theretofore despised, regarding it as unworthy of any man of intelligence or capacity; secondly, because they brought Moslem, Christian and Jew together on a plane of common work and common worth, the most valuable agent for the breaking down of those ancient prejudices, religious, racial and social, which have been the curse and the bane of the land. I was asked to put this down in writing because, I was told, great pressure was being exerted—I regret to say, especially from America—to prevent the management from continuing

this particular work of teaching Jew, Christian and Moslem on the same plane, the demand being that the Jew should not be brought into such contact with the Moslem and the Christian, and that he alone should be trained, that he might not be infected, as it were, by the others, and that they might not be prepared to compete with him for possession of the land. This spirit I met in a more thoroughly organized and offensive form on my latest visit in 1919 and 1920.

I found immense progress in the development of agricultural colonies. There was still difficulty in persuading the Jew, except only the African or Arabian Jew, to do the actual work of the colony, but colonies were prospering, and fruit-culture, vine-culture and especially the manufacture of wine and liquors on a grand and most scientific scale, had progressed wonderfully. In general, the land occupied by those colonies was not in a proper sense ancient Jewish land. They were on the Sharon and Esdrae-lon plains and in the extreme upper end of the Jordan valley; but those regions were being enriched, and the country at large benefited by the colonists. The great bulk of the Jews were still gathered in Jerusalem as heretofore, and there were on one hand the intellectuals and on the other the parasitic or pauperized Jew,—what would ordinarily be regarded as the very best and the very worst. Life in the colonies was often very sweet and very lovely, a wholesome, normal family life, and an exhibition in peace and prosperity of what religious Judaism at its best may be. In Jerusalem one found the extremes of intensely narrow and bitter orthodoxy, and unbelief with extreme bolshevik radicalism. Here, too, aggressive Zionism manifested itself in an attitude of bumptiousness and aggressiveness. The country was for the Jew. It belonged to him and he would shortly take possession. One was made to feel that one's presence in the land was objected to. The Hebrew press contained angry diatribes against the existence of Christian schools and missions. The attitude taken by these Zionists at first alarmed, then aroused and irritated enormously, the native population, both Christian and Moslem, making the Jew an object of dread and hatred as he had never been before. I had opportunities to talk on intimate and friendly terms with

leaders in all camps, albeit I was unable, through language difficulties, to communicate with the rank and file as freely as I should like to have done. I myself felt the annoyance and in some places the danger of the animosity aroused. Under government order I was not permitted to visit certain sections of the country on account of the raids or uprisings of the Arabs, partly due to animosity roused by their apprehension of the Jewish invasion, and partly due to banditry, which took advantage of that as an occasion. In other parts it was difficult to travel, because any stranger, unless he could prove the contrary, was suspected of being an agent of the Zionists, spying out the land for possession by the Jews. It was difficult to obtain lodgings or food, and there were sometimes unpleasantly hostile demonstrations on account of these suspicions. Everywhere it was believed that the Jew by unfair means was seeking to oust the true owners and to take possession of their land. In Jerusalem it was asserted that the Zionist funds, or the Jewish funds which the Zionists could influence or control, were used to subsidize Jewish artisans or merchants to underbid Christians and Moslems and thus oust them by unfair competition, and that similar means were being used to acquire lands or titles to lands. It was even believed by many that the English authorities were unduly favoring and helping the Jews in these endeavors, as is shown by a letter from a Christian in Jaffa published in the *Atlantic Monthly*:—

“We are already feeling that we have a government within a government. British officers cannot stand on the right side because they are afraid of being removed from their posts or ticked off.”

From time immemorial the Jews the world over have contributed for the help of pious Jews in Jerusalem and the other sacred cities, Hebron, Tiberias and Safed, the so-called *halukha* or dole, in return for which the Jews in those cities were to win merit for themselves and those who contributed to their support by study of the law, prayer and pious observances. St. Paul carried over the same practice into the Christian Church, causing alms to be collected in the different congregations to be

transferred to Jerusalem for the benefit and support of the Christians living there. To this day annual collections are taken in the Roman Catholic Churches throughout the world which go to the Franciscans for the same use in Jerusalem. The Greeks and Armenians have like customs. In the past there had been no prejudice with regard to these doles, but now, it was claimed, the Zionist committees were using the monies thus collected or contributed to organize and help their people in a systematized attempt to gain the upper hand in the land.

Perhaps the attitude of the extremists who possessed the dominating power in the community can best be shown by the utterances of one of their own organs, written in Hebrew. (It should be stated that the English edition of this journal was, as a rule, quite different in its contents from the Hebrew edition.) One article, entitled *Malignant Leprosy*, is a denunciation of parents who allow their children to go to any school except those under the control of Jews and conforming to the demands of the local Zionist Committee. Parents are notified that a list has been made by the Zionist Committee of all children who are attending foreign schools, even though they are not subjected to any religious teaching, and it is demanded that they shall be withdrawn from those schools and placed in schools where they shall be taught the Hebrew language, customs and traditions, and kept separate from contamination by the Gentile, with his different ways and customs. Those teaching in foreign schools, or schools not complying with the conditions laid down by this Committee, are ordered to withdraw from their positions. The "malignant leprosy" is the contamination by the outside world which results from education with the Gentiles. It is admitted in this article, in answer to protests, that the opportunities in some of the non-Jewish schools are better than in the Jewish schools,—for example, in the teaching of foreign languages, so important for conducting business or securing employment; that there is greater diligence in instructing; and better hours and better care of pupils. Nevertheless, parents are informed that they must sacrifice for the sake of their race those chances for their children, doing their best meanwhile to raise their own

schools to the higher level. Those who are failing to live up to these ideals are designated as "traitors" and by other opprobrious names, and the article ends with this threat of persecution to any who do not obey the orders of the Zionist Committee thus conveyed:—

"Let him know at least that it is forbidden him to be called by the name of Jew and there is to him no portion or inheritance with his brethren, and if after a time they will not try to reform, let them know that we will fight against them by all lawful means at our disposal. Upon a monument of shame we will put their names for a reproach and blaming forever, and unto the last generation shall their deeds be written. If they are supported, their support will cease, and if they are merchants, with a finger men will shoot at them, and if they are Rabbis, they will be moved far from their office, and with the ban shall they be persecuted, and all the people of the world shall know that there is no mercy in judgment."

This was followed about a month later by a second article, also in Hebrew, entitled *Fight and Win*, which announced that the threatened persecution would now be carried out:—

"The names of the traitorous parents and of the boys and girls who have not taken notice of the warnings ought to be published at once and without delay, in the papers and on public notices, placarded at the entrance of every street. The list of these names should be sent to the heads of every institution and to the rulers of the synagogues, to hospitals, to those who arrange and solemnize marriages, and to the directors of the American Jewish Relief Fund, etc. It should be the title of 'Black List' and 'Traitors to their People'. An order should go forth to all, and if one of these men has a son, he shall not be circumcised; in case of death the body is not to be buried among Israelites; religious marriages will not be sanctioned; Jewish doctors will not visit their sick; relief will not be given to them when they are in need, if they are on the list of the American relief fund—in short, we must hunt them down until they are annihilated. Men will cry to them: 'Out of the way, unclean, unclean!' Because these people will be considered as malicious renegades, there can be no connecting link between them and us. Again, the society of young men and girls of Jerusalem must accept it as a principle to

expel from their societies all those who visit these schools; to point the finger of scorn at them; and to make them see that they are put out of the camp. These traitor scholars, boys and girls, must understand themselves that they are sinners and transgressors, who are isolated, driven from all society, separated from the Jewish community, after they have once despised Israel and its holiness, and it will be interdicted to all sons of Israel to come near them. . . . War against the traitors among our people. War by all means legal. War without pity or mercy; that the traitors may know that they must not trifle with the sentiment of a people. Fight and win."

The Zionist Committee, of whom one was an American, followed this by a printed announcement that the time of grace had passed and that forthwith the names of those who were still refractory would be posted publicly on street-corners, and the boycott begin. Miss Landau, a devout Jewess, the head of the best and highest Jewish school for girls in the city, the Eva Rothschild School, one of those, however, whose pupils and teachers were threatened under these rulings because they would not follow the dictates of the Zionist Committee, appealed to the civil authorities. The Committee was haled into court and the threatened boycott enjoined.

With such an attitude on the part of Zionist leaders in Jerusalem it might be expected that violence would ensue. Easter is a time of great excitement and unrest in Jerusalem for Christians, Jews and Moslems alike, for with Easter coincide the Jewish Passover and the Moslem pilgrim feast of Nebi Musa, when Moslems gather from all over Palestine to hear sermons in the Haram Esh-Sherif, and then march to the so-called tomb of Moses near the Dead Sea. The religious excitement of that season which vents itself in curses of each against the others, is always likely to produce physical outbursts if the cursers come into contact with one another. The Turks wisely segregated at that time each religion in its own quarter. This, in spite of warnings and requests from the Moslem religious leaders, the English failed to do, either through ultra-confidence in the *pax anglicana*, or because of objections from Jewish representatives against such segregation as applied to them. For days before-

hand hot-heads among the Jews and Moslems were inciting to riot, and in their quarter Jewish trained bands were preparing for the conflict, a preparation of which Moslems from long wont probably had no need. On Easter morning, 1920, the fanatical Moslems of Hebron arrived at the Jaffa gate with their sacred banner, singing their songs of religious intolerance. There numerous Jews were waiting to greet them. The English Tommies with their officers were all in church. Whose insults were the worst and who struck the first blow is not clear. Battle was speedily joined. The Jews were better armed, with guns against the Moslem knives; but the Moslems were the better fighters. The city within the walls was speedily in their hands. The Jews living there were the old-time Sephardic families, dwelling close-packed in miserable slums, with no sympathy with Zionism, peaceful and quite unprepared. Moslem fury vented itself on these poor wretches. Without the walls the Jews were in the vast majority. All told, by official count there were at that time 28,000 Jews, 16,000 Christians and 14,500 Moslems in Jerusalem. What the Moslem did within the walls the Jew endeavored to do without the walls. Before my eyes an Arab camp just below the great Jewish quarter was set upon, burned and plundered, the poor inhabitants fleeing for their lives while guns popped from the Jewish quarter. Two men were killed there. When the troops reached the scene the great bulk of rioters whom they rounded up were Jews. The subsequent court proceedings also seemed to place the chief responsibility for the outbreak on them. The major sentences were equally divided between Jews and Moslems, but of the criminals who received lighter sentences the majority were Jews. For a week we lived in a state of siege, not allowed to pass in or out of the city gates, or to show ourselves on roof or balcony after sundown, and for months there were guards at every turn, assemblies were prohibited and there was continual danger of a new outbreak.

The appointment of Sir Herbert Samuel, a Jew, as Governor of the new protectorate under the Zionist Mandate, greatly increased the excitement. In Moslem towns like Nablus it was openly said in my presence that no Jew might enter the place and live. The Christians, who had taken no part in the riots,

were nevertheless to a man in sympathy with the Moslems, and one saw the curious spectacle of Cross and Crescent making common cause. It was prophesied that should Sir Herbert come as Governor he would never enter Jerusalem alive. In point of fact, he landed at Jaffa and came up to Jerusalem under strong guard, with machine-guns before and behind, and the following week made a visit to Nablus and Haifa in the same manner. That was the situation when I left Palestine. Sir Herbert had at that time just issued his declaration and his interpretation of the mandate. English officers and officials almost to a man were against the Zionist Mandate, and their utterances in many cases were extraordinarily frank. Some of the most prominent and best-trained sought transfers to other posts because of their feelings on the matter, and some resigned.

It has since that time been extremely difficult to obtain reliable information of prevailing conditions. It would seem, however, from all the information I have been able to gather, that Sir Herbert, who is, I believe, not himself a Zionist, has acted with singular tact and discretion. He has shown great fairness and indicated his intention to govern with impartiality, granting no special favors to any, nor allowing outside committees or local organizations to dictate or assume to dictate unfair policies. When I left Palestine, Jews were leaving in considerable numbers, especially those claiming American citizenship, so that the outgo was larger than the income. Since then, if I may judge by reports, Jews have been coming in, chiefly from eastern European countries, some parasitic and objectionable, others of a higher type. Some of the latter, graduates of universities, both men and women, may be seen engaged in hard manual labor, I am told, building roads and the like, not despising to do such work in order to secure their Palestinian home and fulfill their aspirations.

It is too soon to judge the future of the Zionist experiment in Palestine. If the English authorities will give fair play to all, and if the Jews will pursue the old policy of the Alliance Israélite and its schools of seeking to benefit all dwellers of the land alike, to break down, not to build up, religious, racial and social prejudices, then the Jew may perhaps overcome the

present prejudice against him, and his invasion of Palestine may prove to be a blessing both to himself and to the land. The methods of those in control of the Zionist movement in Palestine while I was there were, however, aimed in the opposite direction and tended to make the Jew an object of hatred and violence wherever the opportunity for violence offered. This has been illustrated again by the recent bloody riot in Jaffa which compelled the expedition of a British warship to that port; and the order issued holding up all immigration shows that not Jaffa only but the whole country is unsafe. The Jews in Palestine are now protected only by force of British arms. Were the British troops withdrawn, the Jews would be exterminated by the angry natives, of whom the Moslems alone outnumber them in the ratio of more than ten to one; and with such action the neighboring countries would sympathize, yielding ready assistance if any were required. Mesopotamia and Egypt are seething with disaffection against British rule, and racial-religious ferment, and Palestine is to them and to the Arabs of Arabia a holy land included in the heritage of Islam. Moslem India also feels this keenly, and the British have been obliged to withdraw Moslem Indian troops from Palestine, because they will not fight against fellow-Moslems.

In this country the Jewish problem which we have hitherto had to face is not a result of religious antipathy. Religiously, politically and economically, the Jew has the same opportunity as everyone else. The Jewish problem here has been merely a matter of social prejudice, resulting from the extremely difficult task of amalgamating with great rapidity an enormous population, alien in race, culture, custom and habit. In 1880 there were, according to Jewish statistics, 250,000 Jews in this country. The Jews now claim 3,500,000, for the most part an undistributed mass huddled together in a few of the great cities—one-third of them in New York. Coming in such great numbers in so short a time and herding together thus, intentionally or unintentionally they help one another to resist the process of Americanization. This enormously increases the incidence of social prejudice. Those who have no conscious prejudice either of religion or of race are in danger of imbibing or developing such

prejudice as a method of protection of their institutions, their traditions and their habits. The Zionist movement, with its intentional development of race consciousness and race peculiarity on the part of the Jew, is an additional obstacle against the efforts of those Jews and those Christians⁴ who are seeking to break down prejudice and to bring Jew and Christian together within a common recognition of the Golden Rule: that each should treat the other as he in like instance would wish to be treated by him. One of the greatest of English Jews, honored and respected by Jew and Christian alike for his learning, his philanthropy and his godly piety, says of this racial-political Zionism that it has broken his heart, and set the clock backward for his people a hundred years. The Christian lover of his country and his fellow-men may well express a similar feeling on his side.

JOHN PUNNETT PETERS.

The University of the South.

MEMORIES

“Ships . . . they go,” said Murphy, “like a spent pay-roll . . . They’re sunk in the deep water or they’re wrecked in the shoal; Burnt or scrapped in the long run, the big ships an’ small,— An’ the ships a man remembers, they’re the best ships of all.

“Friends . . . they go,” said Murphy, “the false an’ the true, They all go at the finish, the same as the ships do; They go like a spree that’s ended or a last year’s song, But the friends a man remembers, they’re his own his life long.

“Times . . . they pass,” said Murphy, “the fair and foul weather, The good times an’ the bad times, they all pass together; Like a steerman’s trick that’s ended, or a blown-out squall . . . An’ the times a man remembers . . . they’re the best times of all!”

C. FOX SMITH.

Chilbolton, Hants, England.

⁴I use ‘Christian’ here as a designation of the inheritors of the traditions, the culture and the political institutions of modern civilization.